



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,302	12/18/2003	Pak-Lung Seto	P17728	5672
46915 7590 02/06/2008 KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP. ATTN: INT77 315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212			EXAMINER WASEL, MOHAMED A	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

MN

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/742,302		SETO, PAK-LUNG	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Mohamed Wasel		2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/6/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This action is responsive to amendment filed on November 27, 2007. Claims 15, 29 and 32 have been amended. Claims 1-46 are pending and presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coile et al, (hereinafter referred to as "Coile") US Patent No. 6,061,349.

1. As per claim 1, Coile teaches a method, comprising:

maintaining an initial configuration assigning multiple local interfaces to one initial local address (col. 4 lines 45-67, Abstract);

for each local interface, receiving a remote address of a remote interface on at least one remote device to which the local interface connects (col. 2 line 44 – col. 3 line 4); and

using the initial local address to identify the local interfaces assigned to the initial local address in response to receiving a same remote address for each remote interface connected to the local interfaces assigned the initial local address (col. 4 lines 26-44).

2. As per claim 2, Coile teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

generating at least one identifier in response to receiving multiple remote addresses from the remote interfaces connected to the local interfaces (col. 4 lines 45-67); and

assigning different identifiers to the local interfaces previously assigned the initial local address in response to generating the at least one identifier (col. 14 lines 56-67).

3. As per claim 3, Coile teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the initial local address comprises a port address of a port to which the local interfaces are assigned as part of the initial configuration (col. 12 lines 12-33, Fig. 6D).

4. As per claim 4, Coile teaches the method of claim 3, wherein each generated identifier comprises an additional port address, further comprising:

configuring an additional port in the device for each generated additional port address and assigning local interfaces to the ports, including the additional port and port having the initial local address (col. 10 line 50 – col. 11 line 14).

5. As per claim 5, Coile teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the local interfaces assigned to one port connect to remote interfaces having a same remote address (col. 2 lines 44-65).

6. As per claim 6, Coile teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the at least one received remote address is received as part of an identification sequence, further comprising:

transmitting the initial local address to the remote interfaces connected to the local interfaces (col. 2 lines 44-65).

7. As per claim 7, Coile teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the identifiers assigned to the local interfaces, including the at least one generated identifier, comprise local addresses, further comprising:

initiating an additional identification sequence in response to generating the at least one local address (col. 10 line 50 – col. 11 line 14); and

transmitting the local addresses identifying the local interfaces to the connected remote interfaces in response to the additional identification sequence (col. 5 lines 50-65).

8. As per claim 8, Coile teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one remote device and a local device including the local interfaces implement the SAS architecture, wherein the local and remote addresses comprise SAS addresses, and wherein the local and remote interfaces comprise PHYs (col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 20).

9. As per claim 9, Coile teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the remote interfaces having different remote addresses are on different remote devices (col. 8 lines 33-44, Abstract).

10. As per claim 10, Coile teaches the method of claim 2, wherein generating the at least one identifier comprises generating a different identifier for each received different remote address, wherein a combination of the identifiers and the initial local address are used to identify the local interfaces assigned (col. 10 lines 28-49).

11. As per claim 11, Coile teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the plurality of identifiers comprise domains and wherein the initial local address comprises a port address of a port to which the local interfaces are assigned as part of the initial configuration, wherein the local interfaces remain assigned to the port having the initial local address (col. 4 lines 26-45).

12. As per claim 12, Coile teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the remote interfaces having different remote addresses are on different remote devices, wherein the combination of each of the plurality of identifiers and the default local address identify the local interfaces within a local device and wherein the initial local address identifies the local interfaces within the remote devices (col. 4 lines 44-67).

13. As per claim 13, Coile teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the plurality of identifiers comprise domains, further comprising:

for each received remote address, generating a different domain in a local device including the local interfaces connected to the remote interfaces having the remote addresses (col. 4 lines 44-67).

14. As per claim 14, Coile teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the generated domains include one domain in the initial configuration (col. 4 lines 26-45).

15. Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

16. The set of claims 16-28 are rejected under the same rationale as the set of claims 2-14.

17. Claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

18. Claim 30 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

19. Claim 31 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

20. Claim 32 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

21. Claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

- 22. Claim 34 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.
- 23. The set of claims 35-45 are rejected under the same rationale as the set of claims 4-14.
- 24. As per claim 46, Coile teaches the article of manufacture of claim 32, wherein the article of manufacture stores instructions that when executed result in performance of the operations (col. 7 lines 43-53).

Response to Argument(s)

Applicant's argument(s) filed on November 27, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection is maintained.

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues in substance that:
 - a) Coile fails to teach limitations on the context of independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 32 such as using the initial local address to identify the local interfaces assigned to the initial local address in response to receiving a same remote address for each remote interface connected to the local interfaces assigned the initial local address.
 - b) Coile fails to disclose or mention how to determine when to use the same local address for multiple local interfaces.
- In response to argument(s):
 - a) Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Coile discloses a packet translation system for handling connections from clients on an external network to a plurality of IP addresses with a server having a server IP address and a server port number includes a client interface to the external network, wherein the client interface is operative to receive and send packets to and from a remote client. A packet interceptor is operative to intercept incoming packets received at the client interface which have a packet destination IP address and a packet destination port number corresponding to a virtual machine IP address and a virtual machine port number which is supported by the packet translation system. A packet header translator is operative to translate the packet destination IP address and the packet destination port

number of packets forwarded by the packet interceptor to a physical machine IP address and a physical machine port number that corresponds to the server IP address and the server port number of the server. The server port runs a real process corresponding to a virtual process simulated on the virtual port number. As a result, the packet translation system receives packets at the client interface and the packet destination IP address and the packet destination port number corresponding to the virtual machine IP address and the virtual machine port number are translated to the server IP address and the server port number and the packets are forwarded to the server via the server interface (col. 2 lines 44 – col. 3 line 4, col. 4 lines 45-67). Due to the broad claim language, Coile meets the scope of the claimed limitations as currently presented. Examiner believes that amendment to the claims to explicitly distinguish the claimed subject matter would clearly define the scope of the claimed invention and possibly overcome art in record.

- b) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **how to determine when to use the same local address for multiple local interfaces**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number:
10/742,302
Art Unit: 2154

Page 7

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Wasel whose telephone number is (571)272-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MW
February 1, 2008

NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISOR
PATENT EXAMINER